



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,982	01/04/2002	Mark Albert	062891.0613	9525

5073 7590 06/02/2005

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
2001 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 600
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

WANG, LIANG CHE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/038,982

Applicant(s)

ALBERT ET AL.

Examiner

Liang-che Alex Wang

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/4/2002 9/16/2004 Jan
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-31 are presented for examination.

Paper Submitted

2. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file:

- a. **Information Disclosure Statements** as received on ~~01/04/2002~~ is considered.

9/16/2004 JN

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- a. **Abstract is too long**

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 30-31 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. Claims 30 and 31 recites further limitation of the computer medium of claim 28, however, claim 28 is a system claim. Change line 1 of claims 30 and 31 to "The computer readable medium of **claim 29**".
5. All dependent claims are objected to as having the same deficiencies as the claims they depend from.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1, 5-16, 20-24, 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Farris et al., US Patent Number 6,122,357, hereinafter Farris.

8. Referring to claim 1, Farris has taught a system for communicating user identification information over a communications network, comprising:
 - a. a first network interface (figure 1 SSP) operable to establish a communication session with a network user (Col 18 lines 7-10, figure 1, user 1A), the network user having a network locator address (Col 10 lines 63-67, telephone address in this example is a network locator address, Col 8 lines 12-14);
 - b. a second network interface (figure 1, IP 23) operable to process a request sent by the user (Col 9 lines 41-47), in the communication session (figure 4A steps 10-11), the second network interface operable to determine if an identity of the network user associated with the network locator address is stored in a local memory of the second network interface (figure 4 A steps S12-S13, Col 19 line 52- Col 20 line 15), the second network interface operable to obtain additional information about the network user in response to the identity of the network user being stored in the local memory (steps S14-S15, Col 20 lines 24-32), the second network interface operable to process the request according to the additional information (IP terminates the operation (as processing the request) according to the obtaining the additional information).
9. Referring to claim 5, Farris has further taught wherein the second network interface is operable to store the identity of the network user in the local memory and associated the identity of the network user with the network locator address (Col 20 lines 6-9, Col 10 lines 63-67).

10. Referring to claim 6, Farris has further taught wherein the network is an Internet Protocol network and the network locator address is an Internet Protocol address (Col 8 lines 12-14, states Farris' system can be utilized in Internet network, each user could be an Internet based user, and each Internet based user would then have an IP address associated with it in a TCP/IP network.)
11. Referring to claim 7, Farris has further taught wherein the additional information about the network user includes at least one service to be performed on the request (Col 20 lines 32-49.)
12. Referring to claim 8, Farris has further taught wherein the at least one service to be performed on the request includes rating and filtering content of an exchange of information with the network user associated with the request (Col 20 lines 32-49.)
13. Referring to claim 9, Farris has further taught wherein the second network interface associated with the request, the network locator address, and the identity of the network user with the first network interface (figure 4A, steps S12-S15, and Col 10 lines 63-67.)
14. Referring to claim 10, Farris has further taught wherein the first network interface provides the second network interface with an association of the identity of the network user with the network locator address upon establishing the communication session steps figure 4A steps S1-S10.)
15. Referring to claims 11-16, 20-24, 26-37, claims 11-16, 20-24, 26-37 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 1, 5-10. Therefore, claims 11-16, 20-24, 26-37 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 1, 5-10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 2-4, 17-19, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farris.

18. Referring to claim 2 and 3, Farris has taught a system as described in claim 1, and Farris has taught the step of determining that there is no network user identity associated with the network locator address of the network user stored in the local memory (Col 24 line 66 – Col 25 line 1), Farris does not explicitly teach the step of providing the network user identity (from the user or first NT interface) to the second network interface in response to a query.

However, for a system having stored data in the second network interface to match with incoming requests, there must be ways to have the stored data being stored in order to be compared in the future. The stored data would not exist without being provided from the system. In Farris system, the first network interface SSP is the central office (see figure 1), which manages all users associated data and also works as the head of the system (Col 9 lines 35-67). Therefore, if the stored data in the second network interface is being provided somehow, it must be provided from either the central office or from the user itself.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the first network interface and the user to provide the user identity to the second network interface because the stored user data would not exist itself, but must be provided from the system and the user data is definitely provided from the user originally.

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Farris because sending the query to the obtain the user identification provides a way for Farris system to update it's stored user data in the second user interface.

19. Referring to claim 4, Farris as modified has further taught wherein the second network interface is operable to authenticate the identity of the network user received from the first network interface (Col 11 line 65 – Col 20 line 5.)
20. Referring to claims 17-19 and 25, claims 17-19 and 25 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 2-4. Therefore, claims 17-19 and 25 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 2-1.

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objection made. Applicant must show how the amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

Art Unit: 2155

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Liang-che Alex Wang whose telephone number is (571)272-3992. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.
23. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571)272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.
24. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Liang-che Alex Wang *lw*
May 23, 2005

Bharat Barot
BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER